DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 331 SO 030 207

AUTHOR Burnham, Jeffrey B.
TITLE The Nature of Politics and Government...Differing Concepts of "Authority" in the World...Differing Views of the "State." Resource Packet.
INSTITUTION Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY United States Inst. of Peace, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 26p.; Intended to be used with "CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education." For related documents, see SO 030 206-208.
AVAILABLE FROM Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, 1724 Massachusetts Aveune NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Responsibility; Curriculum Guides; Educational Trends; Futures (of Society); Instructional Development; Non Western Civilization; *Political Science; *Political Socialization; Secondary Education; Social Studies; Values Clarification; Western Civilization

ABSTRACT

This resource packet is designed to provide teachers and other civic educators with an introduction to differing concepts of authority views of the state in a complex world environment and to serve as a blueprint for developing materials, classes and programs for civic education. The material discusses: (1) the relationship between the concepts of state, nation, nation-state, and ethnic group; (2) the purposes served by various states and their priorities; and (3) the exercise of political authority and use of power without authority. The papers included are: "On the Concept of Authority" (R. Freeman Butts); "The Soviet View of the State" (The Close Up Foundation); "On the Crisis of Legitimacy in the Communist World" (James H. Billington); and "Citizenship and Different Views of the State" (Jeane J. Kirkpatrick). Discussion questions, program and curriculum ideas, suggested readings, and a list of organizations with related resources conclude the document. (NL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Citizenship Education and Peace Project

ED336331

A project of the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
supported by the United States Institute of Peace

The Nature of Politics and Government

. . . differing concepts of "authority" in the world

. . . differing views of the "state"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JEFFREY B. BURNHAM
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RESOURCE PACKET

February, 1990

Council for the Advancement of Citizenship
1724 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 857-0580

SO 030 207

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Nature of Politics and Government

. . . differing concepts of "authority" in the world

. . . differing views of the "state"

Council for the
Advancement of
Citizenship

This Resource Packet is produced by the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship as a component of the Citizenship Education and Peace Project, with support from the United States Institute of Peace. It is designed to provide teachers, community leaders, and other civic educators with an introduction to differing concepts of authority and differing views of the state in today's interdependent, complex world environment. It is also intended to be used as a companion piece to **CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education**, a new civic education curriculum resource designed to serve as a blueprint from which teachers, curriculum developers, administrators and community leaders can develop civic education materials, courses, programs and curricula to enhance civic literacy in the United States. **CIVITAS** will be published in fall, 1990.

The Council hopes that this packet will be disseminated widely and that it will be used as the basis for classes and programs designed to stimulate understanding of the concepts of authority and the state as they are used around the world. In particular, the packet should help citizens to:

- understand the relationship between the concepts of "state," "nation," "nation-state," and ethnic group and their significance for the creation and governing of independent countries.
- identify the purposes served by various states and the priorities they set among them;
- discriminate between the exercise of political authority and the use of power without authority;
- take positions on whether or not sources of authority are proper and whether the exercise of authority is legitimate in different circumstances.

The Packet was prepared by Dr. Jeffrey B. Burnham, consultant to the Citizenship Education and Peace Project.

The opinions, findings, conclusions and materials found in this packet are those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship or the United States Institute of Peace.

© 1990, Council for the Advancement of Citizenship

The Nature of Politics and Government

. . . differing concepts of "authority" in the world
. . . differing views of the "state"

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. Selected Readings 5

On the Concept of Authority 5
An excerpt from *The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century*
R. Freeman Butts

The Soviet View of the State 7
An excerpt from *Close Up Special Focus: U.S. - Soviet Relations*
The Close Up Foundation

On the Crisis of Legitimacy in the Communist World 10
An excerpt from "Russia's Quest for Identity," published in the *Washington Post*
James H. Billington

Citizenship and Different Views of the State 12
Adapted from "Varieties of Citizenship: Ancient and Modern," in *Rights, Citizenship and Responsibilities: The Proceedings of Freedoms Foundation's Symposium on Citizenship Responsibilities.*
Jeane J. Kirkpatrick

III. Discussion Questions 15

IV. Program and Curriculum Ideas 17
...for schools
...for youth programs
...for community programs
...for higher education

V. Suggested Readings and Other Materials 21

VI. Organizations with Related Resources 25

The Nature of Politics and Government

. . . differing concepts of "authority" in the world
. . . differing views of the "state"

I. Introduction

> *—We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. —That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.*
>
> — The Declaration of Independence

What do we mean by "state" and "authority"? The terms are familiar enough, but arriving at precise definitions turns out to be somewhat complicated. This is because, in the political realm, the meaning of the terms varies according to one's political philosophy. Since these concepts are at the heart of much of the current turmoil in the U.S.S.R., Eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world, it is important for citizens to understand them.

The liberal-democratic view

The Declaration of Independence begins by speaking of a situation in which "it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another." Then the passage quoted above captures the essence of the American view of the state and the American concept of political authority. It thus addresses the concept of "state" in a comprehensive way, covering the purpose and structure of the political system and the source of its authority, as well as the territory and people to be included. Similarly, the Preamble to the Constitution begins, "We the People of the United States . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution . . ."

The ideas expressed in the Declaration and the Preamble embody what is referred to as the "liberal-democratic" view: the state comprises a political system designed by the people it governs, its authority is derived from those people, and those people may change it when and as they see fit.

The liberal-democratic tradition is the norm in the United States, Western Europe and in many countries in other parts of the globe, but it is hardly

universal. Indeed, the dominant political issue of the day, in global terms, involves a great debate over the extent to which countries not nurtured in that tradition should now adopt it. Both its view of the state and its concept of authority compete with other approaches.

The concepts of "legitimacy" and "authority"

Central to the concept of authority is the concept of *legitimacy*. Americans view the authority of their government as legitimate because all those who wield political authority are either elected directly by the people or are responsible to elected officials. Traditional Islamic societies have a very different concept of authority. In the U.S., political authority comes ultimately from the people. In a traditional Islamic society, political authority comes ultimately from God. In such a society, a ruler must be perceived as ruling in accordance with the word of God to retain legitimacy. Marxism offers yet another concept of legitimacy: legitimate authority is based on representing the interests of the working class.

"States," "nations" and "nation-states"

Political authority is wielded by a government over a particular territory and the people in that territory. A government, its people and territory together comprise a "state." The terms "state" and "nation" are often used interchangeably, but in fact mean different things. The state is a geographic and political entity. Nation, when used precisely, refers to a group of people who identify with each other and see themselves as different, or distinct, from all other people. Their highest political allegiance is to their nation. In most cases, a nation includes a particular geographic territory as well a people. The nation is identified by some combination of common bonds, such as language, religion or shared historical experiences which causes the individuals within it to identify with each other. When the nation also comprises a state, that is, when the people and territory of a nation are identical with the people and territory of a state, it is called a "nation-state."

A related concept is that of an "ethnic group." The members of an ethnic group identify with each other on the basis of the same kinds of common bonds as the people of a nation. However, their highest political allegiance may be to something greater than their ethnic group. Many U.S. citizens consider themselves to be part of an ethnic group (for example, Polish, Italian, African-American), but bear political allegiance to the United States of America. Their ethnic and national identities are thus different. The population of Switzerland is made up of two major ethnic groups. One is of French ancestry and still speaks French. The other is of German ancestry and continues to speak German. Yet the members of both groups think of themselves as Swiss. In contrast, for most of the people of France, their ethnic and national identities are the same.

When state and nation are not the same - a source of conflict

When a state comprises more than one nation, its legitimacy, and hence its authority often come into question, because one or more of the nations (or "peoples") it contains feel that their needs and interests are not being met, or that the state is exploiting one people for the benefit of another.

In the late 1800's, Prussia fought a series of wars to unite all the German people (the German "nation") into a single German state. Adolf Hitler used a similar argument to justify the aggression that initiated World War II: he argued that Austria and parts of Czechoslovakia and Poland were ethnically German and thus should be part of the nation-state of Germany. His promise to unite the German nation was a major reason for his popularity in Germany prior to the war.

The Soviet Union is a state, but it contains several nations. Russia, the Ukraine, Lithuania, and Azerbaijan are examples. Russians have always dominated the government and the peoples of the other nations have never accepted the legitimacy, the authority of the Soviet Union. Now, several of those nations are trying to secede from the Soviet Union and to form separate nation-states.

A related problem occurs when state boundaries divide a nation, so that the members of the nation are separated from each other. This is one of the most enduring problems for many countries in Africa. The African continent contains hundreds of different nations, each with a different language and culture from the others. When Europeans divided the continent into colonies, they paid no attention to national boundaries. As a result, most African states contain all or parts of several nations. This has resulted in numerous conflicts over the issue of national self-determination. In some cases, national groups seek to secede from the state of which they are a part and form an independent nation-state (this was the cause of the Nigerian civil war in the 1960's). In others, national groups seek to join with members of their nation in an adjoining state (for example, the people of the Ogaden region of Ethiopia are Somalis and wish to become part of the state of Somalia on Ethiopia's eastern border).

The issue of divided nations still exists in Europe as well. For example, the region of Kosovo in southern Yugloslavia contains many ethnic Albanians, most of whom feel kinship with the people of the country of Albania to the southwest, rather than to other Yugoslavians. The majority of the people in Moldavia, part of the Soviet Union, identify with the people of Romania rather than with the other peoples of the U.S.S.R.

Differing concepts of "authority" and differing views of the"state" thus turn out to be central issues in many of the major events unfolding around the world.

II. Selected Readings

The articles which follow address several aspects of differing concepts of authority in the world and different views of the state. It is recommended that these articles, along with the preceding Introduction, *be copied and distributed to students and community groups to provide a common basis for participation in classroom and community discussions.*

In this first article, Dr. Butts offers a concept of political authority defined in terms of legitimacy *and distinguishes it from sheer power, on the one hand, and* leadership *on the other.*

On the Concept of Authority

by R. Freeman Butts*

At the heart of political authority is the difference between sheer power and legitimate or rightful authority. Power is usually considered to be the ability to exercise control over persons or conditions in such a way as to direct their conduct or influence the outcome of an event desired by those in positions of power. The most common examples of sheer power to control events are military force and money.

On the other hand, power becomes legitimate authority when recognized as such and sanctioned by custom, institutions, law, constitution, or morality. Authority in a democratic polity is thus the exercise of influence and command by those in positions of power when done so within the confines of rules made by the consent of the governed and considered over a period of time as legitimate. Robert M. MacIver, long-time professor of political philosophy and sociology at Columbia University, defined authority as follows:

> By authority we mean the established right, within any social order, to determine policies, to pronounce judgments on relevant issues, and to settle controversies, or, more broadly, to act as leader or guide to other men. When we speak of an authority we mean a person or body of persons possessed of this right. The accent is primarily on right, not power. Power alone has no legitimacy, no mandate, no office. Even the most ruthless tyrant gets nowhere unless he can clothe himself with authority.

---

* Excerpted from R. Freeman Butts, *The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century* (Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education, 1988), pp. 154-7. Copyright Center for Civic Education. Reprinted with permission.

Mortimer Adler nails down the idea in his felicitous phrase "rightful authority." I would underline the fact that the right of an official to make decisions, to determine policies, and to maintain order derives not from the official's private capacity, but by virtue of a right conferred by the society. So the exercise of democratic political authority ideally should be under the constraint of the values of fundamental justice and fairness as well as functioning to ensure the greatest amount of freedom and equal opportunity for the individual under rules of dues process and with a fair distribution of privileges and resources in the society. Failing these constraints, authority is corrupted into authoritarianism and totalitarianism. Without authority, freedom degenerates into license or anarchy, pluralism becomes unstable, and individuals can be assured of little privacy or due process.

. . . Leonard Krieger, university professor of history at Chicago, points out that the idea of authority "as a consciously constituted or legitimate power to command or secure obedience," emerging during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, led historians to mark the period as the origin . . . of the modern idea of citizenship in a nation-state.

But he also indicates that there was another meaning of authority that originated in Rome, [a meaning] not so much associated with sheer power as with an uncoercive authority associated with people or knowledge whose trustworthiness and responsibility are a warrant or guarantee that their deliberate judgments, convictions, and decisions are worth following as models or examples.* An *auctor* in Latin is a trustworthy writer, a responsible person, a teacher, a guarantor, a model whose ideas and judgments are worth following.

[Similarly,] John Gardner uses the term leadership to refer to:

> . . . the process of persuasion and example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to take action that is in accord with the leader's purposes or the shared purposes of all.**

Thus, Gardner distinguishes leadership from coercion on one side and from authority as legitimized power of office on the other side. A leader is an active *auctor* who thinks in the longer term, looks beyond the immediate constituency, [and] puts heavy emphasis on the intangibles of vision, values, and motivation as well as political skill.

---

* Leonard Krieger, "The Idea of Authority in the West," *American Historical Review*, April 1977, pp. 249-70.

** John W. Gardner, *The Nature of Leadership: Introductory Considerations* (Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, 1986), p.6.

In the excerpts below, the Close Up Foundation notes the distinction between "state" and "nation" in the Soviet Union and briefly describes the Soviet view of the State. The material was written in 1986 and so does not fully reflect recent changes in Soviet political structure, but the section on nationalities foreshadowed the current difficulties in Azerbaijan, Lithuania and elsewhere.

The Soviet View of the State

by the Close Up Foundation*

On the distinction between "state" and "nation"

Americans frequently call the Soviet Union "Russia," but that is incorrect. Since 1922, the Soviet Union has been a federal system, composed of individual union republics that together form the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.). Russia - officially called the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) - is the largest of the republics. Russians consider their republic to be the "elder brother" of the fourteen other republics. The fifteen union republics range in size from Armenia (11,506 square miles - somewhat larger than Maryland) to the Russian republic (6,593,391 square miles - over ten times the size of Alaska).

The Soviet population is a mixture of a hundred different nationalities. Fifteen of the sixteen largest national groups have their own union republic. . . Some of them were bitter enemies for hundreds of years prior to imposition of Russian, and then Soviet, rule. While republics such as Moldavia historically had little opportunity to develop a unique national identity, others, like the Central Asian republics, remain fiercely loyal to political, religious, and cultural traditions that in some cases predate Russian civilization itself.

The Soviet regime would like for the various nationalities to become dedicated to the Soviet future rather than to their ethnic past. Soviet leaders have spoken of the need to create a Soviet "new man." Such citizens would speak fluent Russian (the official language of the Soviet Union), would be highly educated, would be willing to leave their native homelands to work elsewhere in the Soviet Union, and would not be bound by ethnic traditions. A nation of Soviet "new men" would result in a Soviet "melting pot," much like that of the United States. However, the Soviets are far from achieving this goal, and they remain plagued by the "nationalities problem." In the Soviet military, where all commands are given in Russian, many Central Asian recruits find it difficult to learn simple procedures because of their inability to understand the language.

---

* Excerpted with permission of the Close Up Foundation from "Differing World Views," *Close Up Special Focus: U.S. - Soviet Relations* (Arlington, Virginia: Close Up Foundation, 1986), pp. 5-17.

On the Soviet view of the purpose or goal of the state

The basic concept behind communism is a very old one. Many early communities, from the ancient to those who settled in colonial America, governed themselves by the principle of a "common pot," into which everyone poured their labors and from which everyone drew their sustenance.

Karl Marx was the most famous exponent of recent communist theory. Reacting to the extreme poverty of the urban masses in highly industrialized nations like England, he protested the capitalist system that took the labors of so many people and distributed the profits that resulted from those labors to so few people. Marx saw an inherent unfairness in the system.

According to Marx, such a system was doomed to destroy itself. He believed that a society would arise in its place in which the society as a whole would own all property. In this communal, or communist, system of ownership, the profits of the citizens' labors would be distributed among them, rather than to a few "overlords."

Marx predicted that the abused workers of industrialized cities would overthrow the capitalist system that he felt was oppressing them. The workers' uprising would be spontaneous and democratic in nature.

Marx did not anticipate that the workers would be able to establish a purely communist society immediately. Instead, he believed that the revolutionary state would have to pass through a period of socialism. During this socialist period, all property would belong to the people, but a state structure would exist to administer the property and wealth of the nation until the society evolved to the point where the state would no longer be necessary.

A young Russian lawyer, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov (Lenin), became a convert to Marxism in 1893. As Lenin continued to develop his thoughts about communism, socialism, and the need for revolution in Russia, he revised some of Marx's ideas in meaningful ways. While Marx and his followers originally had conceived the role of a Socialist party as being primarily one of educating the masses so that they could determine their own fate (presumably by demanding a socialist restructuring of society), Lenin saw the Socialist party as an elite that would provide direction to the masses. In place of the idea that the working masses would make decisions as a group, in a democratic manner, Lenin substituted the concept of a revolutionary elite that would determine political strategy and organize revolutionary activities. Although debate would be allowed among the elite before a decision was reached, once it had been decided, all members would be strictly bound by it, and all debate would end. The current role of the Communist party in the Soviet Union is much closer to Lenin's conception than to that of Marx.

In applying Marxist doctrine to the fledgling Soviet Union, Lenin made many serious changes, including the development of a ruling Communist party that some charge is as dictatorial as its Czarist predecessor. However, Lenin maintained the essential optimism of Marx's belief that a socialist, and then communist, reordering of the world economic system would bring about a more humane world in which all people would be equal. Because Lenin believed the goals of establishing a socialist regime to be so worthy, he justified the violence and repression of individual liberties that accompanied the process. To some extent, the Soviets continue to justify the rigid discipline of the Communist party as a necessary means to a noble end, at which point the need for such strict control will cease to exist.

In the article below, James H. Billington links authority to legitimacy and shows that legitimacy depends not only on the type of government, but also on how the state was formed and on its geographical scope. He further shows that in a multi-ethnic state, legitimacy depends as well upon how power is shared among ethnic groups.

On the Crisis of Legitimacy in the Communist World

by James H. Billington*

The current crisis in the Communist World is basically one of *legitimacy*, not of political leadership or economic productivity.

The decisive element in resolving this crisis will be the *identity* that the dominant Russian nationality defines for itself within the Soviet Union.

Legitimacy is a central problem in Communist states, where power is justified not by counting votes or by investing a monarch with traditional authority. Communist power is legitimate only if its leaders are carrying out their self-proclaimed historical mandate to bring into being a just and abundant egalitarian society.

This secular ideology never had much legitimacy in Eastern Europe, where it was imposed by the Red Army in the wake of World War II. The overthrow of Communist regimes there in 1989 has not yet created alternative political or economic institutions, but it has created an altogether new formula for legitimacy. It combines reasserted religious and national values with newly asserted democratic and constitutional beliefs.

---

* Excerpted with permission from "Russia's Quest for Identity," *The Washington Post* (Outlook Section, Sunday, January 21, 1990), p. B7. © The Washington Post. Dr. Billington, a historian, has been Librarian of Congress since 1987. Prior to that, he was director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

The challenge to Communist legitimacy has not yet gone so far in the U.S.S.R., because Communism is a native rather than an imported movement. It has been in place since World War I, and it partially relegitimized itself by the Soviet victory over Hitler. But Gorbachev, without initially intending to do so, has opened up a crisis of legitimacy in the Soviet Union. This raises the question of whether the U.S.S.R. might also produce a new legitimacy that, however different in timing and form, would essentially replicate the East European pattern of replacing Communism with a benign mixture of national tradition and democratic innovation. . . .

The deep and protracted public outcry about the woes of the U.S.S.R. has been taken by some as a sign of the system's "terminal crisis" or of the people's masochistic immaturity. But it may rather be a rising crescendo in the basic debate over Communist legitimacy that is *deeper*, more *difficult* and more *decisive* in the U.S.S.R. than in Eastern Europe.

The Soviet crisis of legitimacy is *deeper* than in Eastern Europe because it deals with evil inflicted on themselves rather than imposed by others. What Vaclav Havel has profoundly noted about Czechoslovakia—that all who live in totalitarianism share some measure of guilt for its degradations—is far more true of the U.S.S.R., which originated the evil, lived longer under it and is still governed by a political party that killed more of its own people in peacetime than any other government in recorded history.

Resolution of the crisis in the U.S.S.R. will be especially *difficult* not only because the criminal party is still in charge but because the U.S.S.R. is a multi-national state. Soviet leaders cannot simply fall back for legitimacy from Communism to nationalism, asserting unity against a foreign oppressor as in Catholic Lithuania. The national minorities often quarrel with each other; and the largest non-Russian nationalities, in Central Asia and the Ukraine, are themselves divided. The dominant Russian nationality is for the first time led by a post-war generation that is not viscerally inclined to legitimize everything simply by continued indignation against the German invaders of nearly a half-century ago.

The Soviet resolution of the legitimacy crisis will be *decisive*. The Soviet leadership, which opened the Pandora's box of change in the Communist world, retains unparalleled military and police power, which could still be used for a domestic crackdown or for stirring up external trouble. Gorbachev has assembled a leadership that has never been more overwhelmingly Russian in ethnic composition and regional experience. The agitation of national minorities has heightened the self-consciousness of the ruling Russians, who have themselves awakened to seek new answers to the question of who they are and where they are going.

Resolution of the general crisis of legitimacy, therefore, depends to a considerable degree on what kind of a modern identity the ruling Russians define for themselves within the U.S.S.R.

In this article, Ambassador Kirkpatrick examines three varieties of citizenship. In the process, she demonstrates that each concept of citizenship is directly related to a particular view of the state.

Citizenship and Different Views of the State

by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick*

I would like to begin by noting that the classical conception of citizenship saw the citizen as the whole man, or saw the whole man as involved with his role as citizen, and also saw the role of citizen as a sacred duty, as a source of personal obligation and a matter of personal obligation, not at all as a source of personal aggrandizement. The concept of public service, as service, was intimately associated with that conception of citizenship, and it was assumed that when, at various points in the life of Athens, a person's name was drawn by lot to occupy a high civic office, that person would, as a matter of duty, assume that office.

It was not, however, a coercive conception of citizenship. Citizens were not to be coerced into doing their duty. Instead, one of the most sacred and important tasks of a polity, a regime, was to so educate—we would say socialize today—children growing up that they would choose to be citizens; they would be persons who cared about the public weal almost as much as their own private weal. Indeed, the conception of citizenship that quintessentially defines, I think, the classical period drew no distinction between the individual and his society, his state, his regime. There was no dichotomy between the individual and the society.

Everybody knows that we in the liberal democratic tradition have a very different conception of citizenship, because the liberal democratic tradition features at its core a notion of the individual as something separate from, different from his whole society, and sees that individual as fundamentally self-interested in economic affairs and in political affairs, and thinks that is all right.

The liberal democratic tradition does not so much prescribe that individuals should be self-interested individuals; it asserts this is the nature of man, and the nature of man being thus, asks, how can we arrange a polity so that the self-interested individuals can live together in some harmony and achieve some common purposes?

---

* Excerpted with permission of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge from "Varieties of Citizenship: Ancient and Modern," *Rights, Citizenship and Responsibilities: The Proceedings of Freedoms Foundation's Symposium on Citizenship Responsibilities*. The Symposium was held in December, 1984, in Washington, D.C.

There have always been some elements of ambiguity in this, because it has always been also understood that the self-interested individuals could be and, indeed, were affected and shaped by the institutions of their society, by schools and churches and voluntary associations, and that it was possible to train self-interested individuals in such a fashion that they could become reasonably virtuous citizens of a community.

It is the genius, I think, of our tradition and our own Constitution, that they look the self-interested nature of man (and woman, too) squarely in the eye—accept it, and face the question of how, then, can we provide for it. Our Constitution and our tradition generally seek to provide for the civilization, the socialization, the education in the classical sense, of citizens, and also seek to protect us all against each other by a well-ordered constitution in which ambition will be made to counteract ambition.

Totalitarian conceptions are dramatically different from either classical or democratic conceptions of citizenship. The main reason I wanted to allude to the classical conception is that some people argue that classical conceptions of citizenship are the precursors and the model for the totalitarian conception of citizenship, and that what is really involved in totalitarianism is a return to classical conceptions of citizenship. There is a certain, I think quite superficial, similarity at the theoretical level between these. The similarity is that the totalitarian conception of citizenship, like the classical, sees no distinction between the individual and his society, and sees the life and well-being of the individual as coterminous with that of his society, and sees the good of the individual in terms of the good of the society—it cannot conceive an individual good separate from the good of the whole.

But the difference between the totalitarian and the classical conceptions of citizenship is, in my view, above all, coercion, because the very essence of the totalitarian society, its distinctive essence, is the combination of its goals of creating perfectly public-spirited citizens with the coercive mode.

. . . A defining characteristic of the totalitarian is that he seeks the total *coercive* transformation of society, its institutions, character and culture; its ways of viewing the world; its conceptions of what is right and wrong, good and true and untrue. . . The totalitarian seeks to reorder society, culture, and personality, the character of people, by the use of state coercion, if that seems necessary. That is what distinguishes "scientific" socialism from "utopian" socialism, to use Marx's differentiation.

The totalitarian state makes full claim on the life, time, allegiance, skills and resources of a citizen. The totalitarians say: give your life to this collectivity, whose purposes are what we say they are. That is the second distinguishing characteristic of the totalitarian. The first is coercion. The second is the claim of rulers, who are self-designated rulers, to define the full duty of the citizen, which embraces the full life of the individual.

What results is, of course, a society from which choice has been eliminated, because the definitions of self-fulfillment have now been made identical with the purposes of the polity. The individual good has been made identical with the good of the collectivity. Both are defined by the rulers and their definitions are enforced by violence, if necessary. The product is societies saturated by violence, by coercion, and a kind of citizenship in which the citizen is once again transformed into a subject of laws with no real opportunity to participate in the making of those laws to which he is subject.

So we sort of come full circle from the *ideal* of the citizen as perfectly united with the collectivity to the *fact* of subjection and of a society of subjects, who are simply the objects of the action of the state, and all aspects of whose lives, are then the appropriate object of action by the state.

The state claims the right and the duty to organize . . . parenthood, child care, education, vocational choice, geographical location—everything, quite literally, from birth to death. The realm of choice in individual life is narrowed to the point that it disappears.

In the totalitarian state, one confronts a society without citizens and without citizenship, whereas in the liberal democratic society one confronts a society in which citizenship flows continually from the free choices of individual citizens who *decide* to participate—whether as voters or as activists or as leaders or as civic-minded volunteers, or whatever.

The difference, then, is the difference between freedom and slavery, between democracy and tyranny, and between citizens and slaves.

III. Discussion Questions

The following questions can serve as a starting point for discussing differing concepts of authority in the world and differing views of the state.

- A parent, a teacher, a policeman, a state governor, the U.S. President and the Secretary General of the United Nations all have authority. What is the basis of the authority of each? How much power does each have?
- What distinguishes a state from a nation or a nation-state?
- What is the purpose of authority?
- Why is *legitimacy* an important component of authority? If the state has enough *power*, isn't that sufficient for effective government?
- The police in Great Britain almost never carry firearms, yet the citizens almost always obey them without question. Why?
- What does the existence of a secret police force (such as the KGB in the Soviet Union or the *Securitate* in Ceausescu's Romania) tell us about the nature of authority in a state?
- What is it about the U.S. that leads its citizens to think of themselves as Americans first, rather than placing primary emphasis on their ancestral ethnic group?
- Should Lithuania be allowed to secede from the Soviet Union? Should states be allowed to secede from the United States? What, if any, is the difference between the two cases?
- Should Puerto Rico become another state in the United States? Should it be allowed to become an independent country?
- The Navajo Indians have a defined territory and a government and sometimes refer to themselves as the Navajo Nation. Should they be allowed to form a separate nation-state, independent of the United States? Why or why not?

IV. Program and Curriculum Ideas

The following is a list of activities and projects designed to enhance learning about differing concepts of authority in the world and differing views of the state held by countries throughout the world.

. . . For schools

- If your school has a foreign exchange student, invite her/him to make a presentation to a class or a school assembly on the way in which the state and authority are viewed in his/her home country. If your school has more than one foreign student, invite them to compare the views of authority and the state in their different homelands.

- Read about the Marxist-Leninist and liberal-democratic views of the state, focusing on the view each approach holds of the proper relationship between the citizen and the state. Then have each student prepare and present a position paper on what he/she thinks the state should do for its citizens and what the citizen should do for the state. In the process, the student will have to think carefully about the purpose of government and the state.

- Make a large wall map of the U.S.S.R. Draw in the borders of the union republics and the territories of as many ethnic groups (nationalities) as the class can find information on. Divide the class into small research groups and ask each group to prepare a report on the history of one of the major Soviet nationalities.

- Assign a group of students to read a daily newspaper a report regularly to the class on ways in which concepts of "authority," and the "state" are changing in Eastern Europe.

. . . For youth programs

- Organize a group to study differing views of the state and authority held in other countries. Select several countries and write to the embassy of each, asking for copies of their constitutions and materials describing their system of government. Arrange to display these materials at the local public library.

- Many senior citizens enjoy talking to young people about their experiences. Arrange to have your group visit a nursing home or senior citizens center. Working individually or in pairs, have the group members meet one on one with interested senior citizens. Ask each older American to describe the ways in which the popular view of the state and authority has changed during

her/his lifetime. Then, at the next meeting of your group, have each member share what he/she learned with the others.

- Have your youth group study the nationalities problem in the Soviet Union. Then, organize a debate over whether or not the Soviet Union should be dissolved, allowing each nation to form a separate nation-state. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each position? Invite members of the community and media to witness the debate.

- Invite local public officials, such as the mayor, a state legislator, the chief of police or the superintendent of schools to meet with your group. Ask them to discuss their perceptions of the nature and extent of their authority and how it is related to power.

. . . For community programs

- Organize a community forum on "Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union: Changing Concepts of Authority and Differing Views of the State." Invite local scholars, teachers and interested citizens to make presentations.

- Invite recent immigrants to one of the groups meetings and ask them to describe their perceptions of the purpose of the state and the basis for authority in their homelands. Ask them what seems most different about the American approach to these concepts.

- Organize a discussion group to meet monthly at the local public library or community center to study and learn about the origins of different views of authority and the purpose of the state. Select readings from the works of Plato, Machiavelli, John Locke, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln to use as a basis for the discussions.

- Form a study group to examine issues related to how the "state" and "authority" are defined in East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. After completing the study, the group could prepare a presentation of what they had learned to give at a community forum or to history or civics classes at the local high school.

. . . For higher education institutions

- If you don't already have one, form an International Relations Organization. Have the organization arrange a monthly or biweekly series of meetings to follow the evolving efforts of the countries of Eastern Europe to restructure their political and economic systems. Ask one or two individuals to prepare a brief presentation on the latest events in a country of their choice for each meeting.

- Offer a course on differing theoretical concepts of authority and the state, focusing on the writings of the great political philosophers, such as Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, Hobbes and Locke. Conclude the course by showing how the ideas of Hobbes and Locke were incorporated into the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.

- Organize a group to study the effectiveness of modern autocratic, totalitarian states such as Nazi Germany, fascist Italy, Uganda under Idi Amin and Cambodia under Pol Pot. What were the goals of those regimes? How effective were they in achieving them? Did they exercise authority, or just power? What are the advantages and disadvantages of totalitarianism?

V. Suggested Readings and Other Materials

Readings

For those who wish to learn more about differing concepts of authority in the world and differing views of the state, the following list provides a sample of the materials available.

- Timo Airaksinen, *Ethics of Coercion and Authority*, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988.
- Bob Altmeyer, *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism*, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1988.
- Aristotle, *Politics*
- Aristotle, *Ethics*.
- Said A. Arjomand (ed.), *Authority and Political Culture in Shi'ism*, State University of New York Press, 1988.
- Shlomo Avineri, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State*, Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Ernest Barker (ed.), *Social Contract: Essays by Locke, Hume and Rousseau*, Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Reinhard Bendix, *Nation-Building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Social Order*, University of California Press, 1976.
- Erica L. Benner, "Marx and Engels on Nationalism and National Identity: a Reappraisal," *Millennium*, v. 17 (Spring, 1988), pp. 1-23.
- Aryeh Botwinick, *Epic Political Theorists and the State: An Essay in Political Philosophy*, University of America Press, 1982.
- John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State*, University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Post-Communist Nationalism," *Foreign Affairs*, v. 68, n. 5 (Winter 1989/90), pp. 1-25.
- Charles C. Bright and Susan F. Harding (ed.s), *Statemaking and Social Movements: Essays in HIstory and Theory*, University of Michigan Press, 1984

- R. Freeman Butts, *The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century,*, Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education, 1988.
- Martin Carnoy, *The State and Political Theory*, Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Alwar Carre, *Islam and the State in the World Today*, Columbia, Mo.: South Asia Books, 1987.
- Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Republic*.
- George Christi, *Law, Norms and Authority*, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Sheridan House, Inc., 1982.
- Richard T. De George, *The Nature and Limits of Authority*, University Press of Kansas, 1985.
- Anthony DeJasay, *The State*, Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Peter S. Donaldson, *Machiavelli and Mystery of State*, Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- John Esposito, *Islam and Politics* (2nd rev. ed.), Syracuse University Press, 1987.
- Richard A. Falk, *A World Order Perspective on Authoritarian Tendencies*, New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1980.
- Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Gino Germani, *Authoritarianism, Fascism and National Populism*, Transaction Publishrs, 1978.
- Henry A. Giroux, "Authority, Intellectuals, and the politics of Practical Learning," *Teachers College Record*, v. 88 (fall, 1986), pp. 22-40.
- Leslie Green, *The Authority of the State*, Oxford University Press, 1988.
- John A. Hall and G. John Ikenberry, *The State: Concepts in Social Thought*, University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Metin Heper and Raphael Israel (ed.s), *Islam and Politics in the Middle East*, St. Martin, 1984.
- John H. Herz, *International Politics in the Atomic Age*, Columbia University Press, 1959.

- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
- Tarek Y. Ismael adn Jacqueline S. Ismael, *Government and Politics in Islam*, St. Martin, 1985.
- Walter S. Jones, *The Logic of International Relations* (6th ed.), Scott Foresman and Co., 1988.
- Harold J. Laski, *Authority in the Modern State*, Hamden, Ct.: Shoe String Press, 1968 (reprint of 1919 edition).
- Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, *The State and Revolution*.
- John Locke, *Second Treatise on Government*.
- Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*.
- Karl Marx and Frederich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*.
- David Mathews, *The Promise of Democracy: Source Book for Use with National Issues Forums*, National Issues Forums, Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio, 1988.
- Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations* (6th ed.), McGraw Hill, 1985.
- Mehdi Mozaffari, "Authority in Islam: from Muhammad to Khomeini," *International Journal of Politics*, v. 16 (Winter 1986-87).
- Ward Morehouse, *A New Civic Literacy: American Education and Global Interdependence,* Aspen Institute, Princeton, NJ, October, 1975.
- Amos Perlmutter, *Modern Authoritarianism*, Yale University Press, 1984.
- Plato, *Republic*
- Bertrand Russell, *Authority and the Individual* (2nd ed.), Unwin Hyman, 1985.
- John H. Schaar, *Legitimacy in the Modern State*, Transaction Publishers, 1989.
- Richard Sennett, *Authority*, Random House, 1981.
- Woodruff D. Smith, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism,* Oxford University Press, 191989.

- John F. Stack, Jr. (ed.), *The Primordial Challenge: Ethnicity in the Contemporary World*, Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Leonard Tivey, *The Nation-State*, St. Martin, 1981.
- Andrew Vincent, *Theories of the State*, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Barbara Ward, *Five Ideas that Changed the World*, Norton, 1959.
- E.D. Anthony Watt, *Authority*, St. Martin, 1982.

Other Materials

- "Citizenship in the 21st Century," teleconference videotape, National Council for the Social Studies. Topics include: "Citizenship in a Multicultural Society," "Citizenship in a Global Environment," "Citizenship in a Technological Information Society," "Citizenship Education," Washington, DC.
- *Simulations for a Global Perspective* (Intercom 107 1985)
  For grades 7-12, this resource presents several complete simulation games, including "Spaceship Earth," to help develop global awareness. The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038.
- *The New Global Yellow Pages.* A resource directory listing 172 organizations and projects that provide services related to global/international education. The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038.
- *The New Global Resource Book.* A resource directory of materials available on a broad range of global/international topics with annotated listings of books curriculum materials, and audiovisual materials. The American Forum for Global Education, 45 John Street, Suite 1200, New York, NY 10038.

VI. Organizations with Related Resources

The following organizations publish materials that address issues related to differing concepts of authority in the world and differing views of the state

The American Forum for Global Education
45 John Street, Suite 1200
New York, NY 10038
212/732-8606

Center for Civic Education*
5146 Douglas Fir Rd.
Calabasis, CA 91302
818/340-9320

Center for Teaching International Relations
University of Denver
Denver, CO 80208
303/871-3106

Close Up Foundation*
1235 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202
703/892-5400

Constitutional Rights Foundation*
601 S. Kingsley Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90005
213/847-5590

Ethics and Public Policy Center
1030 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202/682-1200

Foreign Policy Association*
1800 M St. NW, Suite 295
Washington, DC 20036
202/293-0046

Kettering Foundation*
200 Commons Rd.
Dayton, OH 45459
800-221-3657

Mershon Center*
Ohio State University
199 W. 10th Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201
614/292-1681

SIETAR International
1505 22nd St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20037
202/296-4710

United Nations Association of the USA
Model UN and Youth Programs
485 Fifth Ave
New York, NY 10017-6104
212/697-3232

United States Institute of Peace
1550 M Street, Suite 700 NW
Washington, DC 20005
202/457-1700

*Organizational member of the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship